UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,877	04/05/2004	Steven E. Strauss	STRAUSS 13	2669
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC 7th Floor 2000 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-3307			EXAMINER	
			PARRIES, DRU M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/816,877	STRAUSS, STEVEN E.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	DRU M. PARRIES	2836
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 1 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/816,877 Page 2

Art Unit: 2836

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 20, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the newly added limitations, Brodeur teaches a control system (38, 41, 42) which acts identically to the newly claimed "power management state machine."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Brodeur (6,525,434). Admission teaches an integrated circuit with a power management architecture including power rails supplying power to a plurality of sections (three sections, each including one of 402, 403, 404). Admission teaches a first integrated voltage regulator (500) to supply power to said power rail. (Fig. 5) He fails to teach a plurality of voltage regulators and voltage meters, the inner workings of the first integrated voltage regulator, and a control system. Brodeur teaches the inner workings of a first voltage regulator (31-34, 42), a plurality of voltage regulators (35-38) and a plurality of voltage meters (nodes closest to V_{out}, connected to 38), each being associated with a different section (with a different V_{out}), and all sections have a voltage meter. He also teaches the output of the first voltage regulator being controlled based on voltage levels of said plurality of sections (info received from 41). Brodeur also teaches regulating the output voltage of each of the plurality of voltage regulators being

Page 3

controlled (via 35, 38), based on the voltage level measured at each voltage meter, to be able to supply the correct power to the power rail and each load that is being powered by each section.

(Fig. 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the inner workings of Brodeur's first voltage regulator in Admission's first integrated voltage regulator since Admission was silent on this issue and Brodeur teaches a version that is known in the art. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the plurality of voltage regulators and voltage meters, and the control system of Brodeur's system, associated with each section of the system, into each section of Admission's invention so that each section of the system could have the precise output voltage necessary for each section and in turn would add more versatility to the system to be able to power a more diverse grouping of loads. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Brodeur's elements (voltage regulators, meters, etc.), into the Admitted Art's invention, in integrated circuit form, so that Admitted Art's invention can still function properly.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry, can be reached on 571-272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/816,877 Page 4

Art Unit: 2836

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be
obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

3-25-2008

/Michael J Sherry/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2836